NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior to filming.

CIS Congressional Information Service Washington, D.C.

CSCE DIGEST

March 1989

CSCE MILITARY SECURITY TALKS BEGIN IN VIENNA

CSBM and CFE Negotiations Commence

On March 9, talks officially opened in Vienna to build upon and expand the results achieved at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security- Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe (CDE) in 1986. Participating are all 35 CSCE states. In addition, representatives of 23 NATO and Warsaw Pact countries began negotiations within the framework of the CSCE process on Conventional Armed Forces In Europe, (CFE) from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Preceding the official opening of the talks was a foreign ministers' meeting at the Hofburg Palace in Vienna. Secretary of State James A. Baker III addressed the meeting March 6 on the "New Horizons in Europe."

At the opening session of the CSBM talks on March 9, U.S. head of delegation John J. Maresca spoke of the need to extend the openness and confidence sought in military affairs to the relationship between governments and the governed throughout Europe. On Friday March 10, Representative Steny H. Hoyer, Co-Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, spoke at the CSBM plenary on the inextricable relationship between the realization of enhanced security and the accomplishment of dramatic human rights progress.

Excerpts from all 3 speeches follow:

New Horizons in Europe

An address by Secretary of State James A. Baker III before the Foreign Ministers' Meeting on March 6, 1989 in Vienna.

We meet here today in an historic setting. Vienna, of course, is a living monument to the creativity of Western culture. This city is also a crossroads of civilization. It reminds us that Europe and the achievements of Europe have always gone beyond the limits of geography to influence the wider world.

But Vienna also bears witness to vanished hopes. Negotiations and agreements intended to bring enduring peace to Europe have been discarded too often in war. Too often the lack of security in Europe has meant a lack of security for the entire world. That is why we are meeting here to negctiate. Our purpose is to improve the security of Europe, thereby also strengthening the foundations of world peace.

I believe that we need a larger perspective, a common vision of where we are headed and why, if we are to succeed.

After the Second World War, Europe and the world were confronted by two distinctly opposing views. The United States and its allies in Western Europe held the vision of free peoples, living under the rule of law, their individual freedoms protected, and their democratic governments responsible to those people.

We believed, and continue to believe, that freedom of speech, and of religion, freedom from fear and freedom of opportunity, were and are the natural rights of free men everywhere. We were certain, and we continue to be certain, that free markets and individual initiatives are the surest routes to social and economic progress. We sought, and we continue to seek, our security in a coalition of free nations, drawn together by common values, not only mutual interests. And we envisioned then as we envision now, a Europe at peace, its nations free to develop in diversity but united against war.

Our vision was not the only vision. There was another view, opposed to the values most cherished by the West. And the competition between the two visions have us the difficult legacy with which we live today. A Europe, forcibly divided against the will of its peoples. A Europe, the most heavily armed continent in the world.

I propose that we dedicate ourselves to creating a new Europe -- a Europe based on all these freedoms;

- The freedom of all Europeans to have a say in decisions which affect their lives, including freedom of the workplace. The legality of Solidarity, for example, should really be the norm, and not the subject for negotiations.

- The freedom of all Europeans to express their political differences, when all ideas are welcome and human rights are truly inviolable. Monitors of the Helsinki agreements, for example, should be honored, and not hunted by their governments.

- The freedom of all Europeans to exchange ideas, and information and to exercise their right to freedom of movement. The researcher in Prague, for example, should be able to find the books he needs. Barbed wire should not separate cousins in Hamburg from cousins in Dresden. And a wall should not divide Berlin, continuing, as we've seen just in the past month, to cost the lives of people seeking freedom.

- Finally, the freedom of all Europeans to be safe from military intimidation or attack. Those in the West should be free of the fear that the massive forces under Soviet command might invade them. Those in the East should be free of the fear that armed Soviet intervention, justified by the Brezhnev doctrine, would be used again to deny them choice.

"We propose an overall limit on the total armament in Europe and that no more than 40,000 tanks should be deployed by the 23 participating States in the CFE negotiations"

In recent years, we have seen reason to be hopeful about the new Soviet thinking. But, both realism and prudence require that we test the new thinking to make sure that it means new policy and above all, changes in military deployments. We have sought to discover whether East and West could take steps together - irreversible steps - that lead toward the Europe of the Freedoms. And we have also sought to reduce the level of military confrontation.

We can define the issue simply. A vast force, spearheaded by heavily armored units and supported by massive firepower, has been fielded by the Soviet Union and its allies. That force points West.

(continued on page 2)

J892-17

(Baker, continued from page 1)

We in the West have faced this threat since the dawn of the Cold War. Today, Soviet and Warsaw Pact military forces go far beyond those conceivably needed for defense. Warsaw Pact tanks outnumber NATO tanks by over 3 to 1. Warsaw Pact artillery exceeds NATO's artillery by 3 to 1. And the Warsaw Pact holds more than a 2 to 1 advantage over NATO's armored troop carriers.

It is this array of Soviet armed might that divides Europe against its will and holds European hopes hostage to possibly hostile Soviet intentions.

The United States, together with the other Western participants in these talks, has developed serious proposals to end disparities in conventional ground forces and to introduce far-reaching confidence building and stabilizing measures.

Our approach focuses on the achievement of significant reductions in key military capabilities that are designed for invasion. For example, we propose an overall limit on the total armament in Europe and that no more than 40,000 tanks should be deployed by the 23 participating States in the CFE negotiations. In addition, Western participants are prepared to introduce new confidence-building measures in the near future, aimed at increasing transparency and reducing the possibility of surprise attack. Ultimately, of course, stability will be achieved when no country is able to dominate by force of arms.

As these negotiations unfold, we and our allies will explore every opportunity for progress. The current force levels and force structures in Europe are not engraved in stone. They are the product of history, the results of conflict. And they can be changed.

I have argued that a clearer understanding of the Europe of the future will ease the burden. Already, we can glimpse part of that horizon of a peaceful and prosperous Europe for which so many have sacrificed. Yet though it beckons, we know that nothing can be taken for granted. It falls to us to take the next step, if not the final one, on this journey.

"The current force levels and force structures in Europe are not engraved in stone. They are the product of history, the results of conflict. And they can be changed"

Prophecy is God's gift to but a few, yet imagination is the birthright of every human being. We can but dimly see the future through the mists of change, yet we can all imagine the world we would like to see. That is the summons of our undertaking.

Greater Freedoms Represent The Future

Remarks by John J. Maresca, Head of the U.S. Delegation, at the Opening Session of the CSBM Talks on March 9.

The negotiations we are inaugurating today will be about security. But as we commence our common effort, we will do well to recall the breadth of that concept. If our experience in CSCE has taught us anything, it has been that the security of nations can neither be fully measured nor ultimately achieved through military means alone. Indeed, the military confrontation which has plagued Europe for 40 years is the reflection - not the cause - of the political and social division of the Continent.

The proposal tabled by the members of the North Atlantic Alliance today, constitutes an important step toward building this kind of confidence in the area of military affairs. That is why the United States fully supports it. Nations cannot be expected to reduce their military forces unless they have some measure of confidence that their neighbors harbor no hostile intentions toward them. Massive Soviet and Warsaw Pact deployments of offensively-capable forces throughout Central Europe, as well as on the flanks of the European Continent, do not inspire confidence. Add to that closed frontiers, supression of political and labor movements and the suffocating secrecy which has shrouded virtually all aspects of Warsaw Pact military affairs, and it is no wonder that the West has for four decades viewed its neighbors to the East with suspicion and fear.

Our proposal is designed to continue the task of reducing this wall of suspicion. The measures we and our allies have proposed go to the heart of the confidence problem in European military affairs. Put simply, we propose that all European states should exchange on an annual basis complete information on what conventional forces and armaments they have on the European Continent, and where they are deployed. To deepen our confidence in the information we receive, we will press for the right to evaluate it directly.

I think we can be genuinely optimistic on the prospects for moving in the direction of a more stable and secure future for Europe. The climate of East-West relations today may be more conducive to advancing the agenda of peace and security than at any time in the past 40 years. The "New Thinking" in the Soviet Union and in some countries of Eastern Europe holds out the possibility of a change in the attitudes of those Governments towards their neighbors and their citizens.

"The climate of East-West relations today may be more conducive to advancing the agenda of peace and security than at any time in the past forty years"

However, our optimism should be tempered by realism and prudence. Just as there are opportunities we must pursue, there are realities we cannot ignore. The Cold War was not a mirage. It was a real international situation with identifiable characteristics: the political division of Europe; the militarization of East-West relations; and the competition between two largely incompatible social and economic systems. All of these characteristics, to a greater or lesser extent, remain with us today.

The task at hand -- extending openness and confidence in military affairs -- is an important one. But, as I noted when I began, our efforts are only part of a broader process. The confidence and openness we seek in military affairs must also extend to the relationship between governments and the gov-

(continued on page 3)

(Maresca, continued from page 2)

erned throughout Europe. Only when ideas, people and information move freely across borders; and individuals everywhere have a say in the decisions which affect their lives, will we be able to achieve a Europe which is truly stable and secure.

These thoughts are old friends to many of us; an attractive alternative to others; unfortunately, they are still perceived as a threat by some. Regardless of how one views them, however, these simple ideas represent the future.

International Security and Respect for Human Rights are Inseparable

Address By Helsinki Commission Co-Chairman Steny H. Hoyer Before the CSBM Plenary On March 10, 1969

Today I come before you as Co-Chairman of the congressional commission that monitors the Helsinki Final Act. I speak for the Chairman, Senator Dennis DeConcini and I am joined by Congressman Edward Feighan of Ohio, a member of the Commission and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

It has been almost 3 years since I first had the privilege of addressing a CSCE meeting dedicated to military security questions. That was the Stockholm Conference in May 1986.

Much has changed since that time. The delegations at Stockholm reached consensus on significant security measures which improved confidence among nations by reducing secrecy. An important principle was established at Stockholm which paved the way for the inclusion of the truly historic verification elements of the INF treaty. That treaty, which President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev signed less than 2 years ago, will eliminate an entire class of intermediate nuclear force missile systems.

More recently, the conclusion of the Vienna Review Meeting saw significant steps being taken in the East to enlarge certain freedoms. Though far from assured and far from absolute, those steps continue today in varying degrees and are the best evidence I can see of the continuing vitality and promise of the Helsinki process.

Even though we have made significant gains, trust has been a vital missing ingredient in our negotiations. To bridge the gulf of suspicion that separates our nations we need to undertake concrete actions that further a basic objective of confidence- and security-building measures, that of transparency. Practical measures such as the timely exchange of data, particularly regarding the structure and location of military forces in Europe, would go a long way toward reducing the mistrust engendered as much by lack of information as by misinformation.

There is a common interest in avoiding the risks of uncontrolled confrontation. By seeking greater openness through increased information exchange, we reduce the risks of misperceptions regarding each other's intentions and military activities and the likelihood of such misperceptions triggering a spiral of hostile reactions leading to confrontation.

It is with this goal in mind that we begin a new series of meetings here in Vienna to build upon a foundation premised on shared ideals. First, no nation can achieve security by exploiting the insecurities of its neighbors because any resulting instabilities are equally dangerous to all concerned. Second, selective implementation of existing agreements only serves to foster disillusionment and mistrust and ultimately undercuts our collective effort to achieve a lasting peace. And it should not be forgotten that in our search for mutual security, the fervor with which we seek arms agreements should be matched by determined and systematic efforts to achieve significantly greater progress in the area of human rights. A successful blueprint for a safe reduction in armaments includes a demonstrated commitment to individual freedom and is grounded in fundamental moral principles and shared interests.

We in the United States have been pleased to see that President Gorbachev, in his new thinking, has recognized the need to include human rights in traditional concepts of security. We hope that this new thinking will permeate these negotiations as well as the negotiations on conventional forces in Europe.

We meet at a time of renewed promise and hope for progress on the Helsinki agenda. That agenda encompasses increased security and stability between us; enhanced economic cooperation; more respect and freedom for individuals who comprise not only our own nations, but also the community of nations; and a more faithful adherence to principles that the Helsinki Final Act sets forth to guide our relations with one another.

Adoption and implementation of the concrete, verifiable confidence- and security-building measures that are at the heart of the Stockholm Document represent a significant step forward in the Helsinki process. For all the difficulties that may lie ahead, an historic opportunity awaits us here today. As an integral part of the ongoing Helsinki process, this meeting affords the nations of Europe, Canada, and the United States the opportunity to build upon those measures and foster greater openness, predictability, and mutual understanding about what otherwise might be threatening and destabilizing.

> *"Since we evaluate not only a country's military policies but also its human rights practices in forming our assessments of them; we should come to see respect for human rights as a fundamental and crucial CSBM"*

The experience of CSBMs has demonstrated that there is an integral link between the concepts shaped here and the larger military, as well as political, competition between states. Since we evaluate not only a country's military policies but also its human rights practices in forming our assessments of them; we should come to see respect for human rights as a fundamental and crucial CSBM.

This fully accords with the central tenet of the Helsinki Final Act, that international security and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms are inseparable. Therefore, peace overtures, no matter how inviting or grand, must be tested by a state's own human rights practices, for we firmly believe that the manner in which a state deals with its own citizens is a harbinger of the type of relationship it will establish with other states.

Before concluding, I would like to comment on the other set of negotiations taking place in Vienna, the CFE talks. Although there has long been awareness of the need to address destabilizing imbalances in conventional forces in Europe, a sense of

(continued on page 4)

(Hoyer, continued from page 3)

> *"Peace overtures, no matter how inviting or grand, must be tested by a state's own human rights practices, for we firmly believe that the manner in which a state deals with its own citizens is a harbinger of the type of relationship it will establish with other states."*

urgency has arisen since the signing of the INF treaty. The CSCE process can play an increasingly important role in enhancing international stability by providing the framework for the CFE talks and the impetus for progress in those talks.

The concern of the Commission and the United States is that the importance of these talks not obscure or diminish the imperative of achieving significantly greater progress in human rights. Parallel progress on security and human rights within the CSCE process is essential to stability and closer cooperation.

The inextricable relationship between the realization of enhanced security and the accomplishment of dramatic human rights progress continues to be the central premise of the U.S. Congress and the American people. The fact is - there is no other forum like CSCE which explicity sets forward as political goals of each of the signatory states, progress in the area of human rights and fundamental freedoms along with increased cooperation in areas of trade, exchanges, and military security. Balance among the different aspects of East-West relations is not a rhetorical goal. It is a political objective, compelled by a reading of the history of this Continent and of mankind, which leads us to the inescapable conclusion that without that balance there is no lasting security or stability.

On behalf of the U.S. Congress, I wish you well as you participate in the continuation of the Helsinki process -- a process which has exceeded our expectations and which promises a more secure and cooperative future for our people.

London Information Forum

Leonard H. Marks has been designated to head the U.S. Delegation to the Information Forum. Mr. Marks, a former director of the United States Information Agency, currently serves as legal counsel to the World Press Freedom Committee. He has headed a number of U.S. delegations including the U.S. observer delegation to UNESCO and two U.S. delegations to the International Telegraphic Union Conferences on high frequency broadcasting.

CSCE DIGEST

COMMISSION ON SECURITY
AND COOPERATION
IN EUROPE
Congress of the United States
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515

Official Business

M.C.